

REMARKS

Upon entry of this amendment, claims 1-10, 12 and 13 are all the claims pending in the application. Claims 11 and 14-17 have been canceled by this amendment without prejudice or disclaimer to the subject matter recited therein.

I. Claim Rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 101

Claims 13-17 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 101 as being directed to non-statutory subject matter.

Regarding claim 13, Applicants note that this claim has been amended so as to indicate that the computer program is embodied on a “non-transitory computer-readable storage medium”, thereby rendering this claim statutory under 35 U.S.C. 101. Regarding claims 14-17, as noted above, these claims have been canceled by this amendment.

In view of the foregoing, Applicants respectfully request that the above-noted rejection be reconsidered and withdrawn.

II. Claim Rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 102

A. Claims 1-3 and 12-17 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by Kurano et al. (EP 0 737 974).

Claim 1, as amended, is directed to a content use device for using composite content recorded on a recording medium, the composite content including a plurality of pieces of content that are respectively protected by a plurality of different protection methods, the content use device comprising a determination unit operable to determine, from among the plurality of different protection methods, one protection method that corresponds to the selected one piece of

content; and a decryption unit operable to decrypt the selected one piece of content based on the determined protection method.

Applicants respectfully submit that Kurano does not disclose or suggest at least the above-noted features recited in amended claim 1.

In this regard, Applicants note that Kurano discloses the following:

(i) “Restriction information for selectively restricting reproduction or presentation of the prescribed data piece(s) is recorded in the management area and/or the data area”. (see column 2, lines 16 to 19);

(ii) “More specifically, it is checked from the parental level of each sequence (program chain), whether each sequence (program chain) is to be subjected to restriction of the parental control, or is to be subjected to reproduction restriction. If it is determined that a given sequence (program chain) is to be subjected to the reproduction restriction (step S28, yes), this sequence (program chain) is not reproduced (step S29), and characters indicating that parental control is being performed are displayed on monitor section 6 (step S30). The next sequence is then loaded. If the next sequence is not subjected to parental control (step S28, no), reproduction is resumed (step S31 in FIG. 29). (see column 27, line 55 to column 28, line 9);

(iii) “If it is determined that a given cell is to be subjected to reproduction restriction (step S34, yes) a reproduction inhibition signal is output to each of decoder sections 58, 60, and 62, so as to stop output of any decoded signal (step S35).” (see column 28, lines 31 to 35); and

(iv) “Alternatively, if the cell representing a specific scene of a given title is subjected to the parental control, this scene may be replaced with another scene, or switching to another angle of multi-angle pictures prepared separately may be performed (step S35).” (see column 28, lines 36 to 40).

Based on the above-noted disclosure in Kurano, Applicants note that while Kurano discloses a system which utilizes parental control information, that Kurano does not disclose or suggest that a composite content including a plurality of pieces of content that are respectively protected by a plurality of different protection methods is recorded on a recording medium. As such, Applicants respectfully submit that it would not be necessary in Kurano to determine a protection method corresponding to a selected piece of content.

Therefore, Applicants respectfully submit that Kurano clearly does not disclose, suggest or otherwise render obvious the above-noted features recited in amended claim 1 of a determination unit operable to determine, from among the plurality of different protection methods, one protection method that corresponds to the selected one piece of content; and a decryption unit operable to decrypt the selected one piece of content based on the determined protection method.

It is noted that by providing the above-noted features recited in amended claim 1, that even when composite content including a plurality of pieces of content that are respectively protected by a plurality of different protections methods is recording on a recording medium, the determination unit determines a protection method corresponding to the selected one piece of content, and the decryption unit decrypts the selected one piece of content based on the determined protection method. Accordingly, a situation never occurs in which a piece of content is decrypted based on an inappropriate protection method. Thus, a problem will never occur such as a content use device hanging up in the case of an error occurring when a piece of content is decrypted.

In view of the foregoing, Applicants respectfully submit that amended claim 1 is patentable over Kurano, an indication of which is kindly requested. Claims 2 and 3 depend from

claim 1 and are therefore considered patentable at least by virtue of their dependency.

Regarding claims 12 and 13, Applicants note that both of these claims have been amended in a similar manner as claim 1 so as to indicate that a composite content includes a plurality of pieces of content that are respectively protected by a plurality of different protection methods, and to recite the steps of determining, from among the plurality of different protection methods, one protection method that corresponds to the selected one piece of content; and decrypting the selected one piece of content based on the determined protection method.

For at least similar reasons as set forth above with respect to claim 1, Applicants respectfully submit that Kurano does not disclose, suggest or otherwise render obvious the above-noted features set forth in amended claims 12 and 13. Accordingly, Applicants submit that claims 12 and 13 are patentable over Kurano, an indication of which is kindly requested.

B. Claims 1-7, 10 and 12-17 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by Revis (US 6,704,491).

Regarding claim 1, as noted above, this claim has been amended so as to be directed to a content use device for using composite content recorded on a recording medium, the composite content including a plurality of pieces of content that are respectively protected by a plurality of different protection methods, the content use device comprising a determination unit operable to determine, from among the plurality of different protection methods, one protection method that corresponds to the selected one piece of content; and a decryption unit operable to decrypt the selected one piece of content based on the determined protection method.

Applicants respectfully submit that Revis does not disclose or suggest at least the above-noted features recited in amended claim 1.

In this regard, Applicants note that Revis discloses the following:

(i) "Currently, newer technologies such as digital video disk (DVD) allow for sanitized versions of a work to reside on the same disc as the original work. By setting a given "Parental Level," corresponding to a desired permissible ratings level, the software of the DVD player will allow a reviewer to pick and play the set level for the work. Parental levels restrict either the playback of an entire work or of certain scenes (comprised of video frames) of the work. Parental level codes are placed on the disc in each scene so that the user can automatically select the proper path from scene to scene. This allows multiple rating versions of a movie to be put on a single disc. For this to work, the video must be carefully broken down into scenes. Objectionable scenes must be coded so that they can be skipped over, or alternate versions of the scenes must be provided and appropriately coded." (see column 1, lines 48 to 64);

(ii) "In one aspect of the invention, a method for controlling reproduction of a displayable work stored on a recording medium the work having at least one assigned ratings level associated with at least one scene is provided." (see column 2, lines 15 to 19); and

(iii) "The apparatus further provides a reproduction device for selectively reproducing scenes from a recording medium, a display device coupled to the reproduction device for displaying the selectively reproduced scenes and a controller responsive to entry of a first ratings level for controlling the reproduction device to cause the selective reproduction and display of scenes from a recording medium having the entered ratings level and for recording an entered accept or reject command associated with the displayed scenes." (see column 2, lines 30 to 39).

Based on the above-noted disclosure in Revis, Applicants note that while Revis discloses a system which utilizes parental levels for restricting either the playback of an entire work or of certain scenes, that Revis does not disclose or suggest that a composite content including a

plurality of pieces of content that are respectively protected by a plurality of different protection methods is recorded on a recording medium. As such, Applicants respectfully submit that it would not be necessary in Revis to determine a protection method corresponding to a selected piece of content.

Therefore, Applicants respectfully submit that Revis clearly does not disclose, suggest or otherwise render obvious the above-noted features recited in amended claim 1 of a determination unit operable to determine, from among the plurality of different protection methods, one protection method that corresponds to the selected one piece of content; and a decryption unit operable to decrypt the selected one piece of content based on the determined protection method.

As noted above, by providing the above-noted features recited in amended claim 1, even when composite content including a plurality of pieces of content that are respectively protected by a plurality of different protections methods is recording on a recording medium, the determination unit determines a protection method corresponding to the selected one piece of content, and the decryption unit decrypts the selected one piece of content based on the determined protection method. Accordingly, a situation never occurs in which a piece of content is decrypted based on an inappropriate protection method. Thus, a problem will never occur such as a content use device hanging up in the case of an error occurring when a piece of content is decrypted.

In view of the foregoing, Applicants respectfully submit that amended claim 1 is patentable over Revis, an indication of which is kindly requested. Claims 2-7 and 10 depend from claim 1 and are therefore considered patentable at least by virtue of their dependency.

Regarding claims 12 and 13, as noted above, both of these claims have been amended in a similar manner as claim 1 so as to indicate that a composite content includes a plurality of

pieces of content that are respectively protected by a plurality of different protection methods, and to recite the steps of determining, from among the plurality of different protection methods, one protection method that corresponds to the selected one piece of content; and decrypting the selected one piece of content based on the determined protection method.

For at least similar reasons as set forth above with respect to claim 1, Applicants respectfully submit that Revis does not disclose, suggest or otherwise render obvious the above-noted features set forth in amended claims 12 and 13. Accordingly, Applicants submit that claims 12 and 13 are patentable over Revis, an indication of which is kindly requested.

III. Claim Rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a)

A. Claims 8 and 9 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Revis (US 6,704,491) in view of Sato et al. (US 5,884,004), and have also been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kurano (EP 0 737 974) in view of Sato et al. (US 5,884,004).

Claims 8 and 9 depend from claim 1. Applicants respectfully submit that Sato does not cure the deficiencies of Revis or Kurano, as described above, with respect to claim 1.

In particular, Applicants note that while Sato discloses that “[i]n the parental locked scene period, however, only one of the available scenes, scenes 6 and 7, having different content can be selected, and must be selected statically before playback begins” (see column 33, lines 3 to 7), that Sato does not disclose, suggest or otherwise render obvious the above-noted features recited in amended claim 1 which indicate that composite content includes a plurality of pieces of content that are respectively protected by a plurality of different protection methods, the content use device comprising a determination unit operable to determine, from among the plurality of

different protection methods, one protection method that corresponds to the selected one piece of content; and a decryption unit operable to decrypt the selected one piece of content based on the determined protection method.

In view of the foregoing, Applicants respectfully submit that claims 8 and 9 are patentable over the cited prior art, an indication of which is kindly requested.

B. Claim 11 has been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Revis (US 6,704,491) in view of Takechi et al. (US 7,146,498).

Regarding claim 11, as noted above, this claim has been canceled by the present amendment. With respect to Takechi, however, Applicants note that this reference discloses the following:

"The problem to be solved is that once copyright claimed AV data is passed to application software, the application software can freely process the AV data for recording, etc., defeating the purpose of copyright protection. The invention provides a computer which comprises a system section 12 and an application software section 13, and which takes in copyright claimed, encrypted data via a digital interface 1 for processing therein, wherein the system section 12 judges that the application software section 13 is legitimate application software for the protection of copyright, and if the application software is a legitimate one, the system section 12 passes a key for the encrypted data to the application software section 13." (see Abstract).

Based on the foregoing description of Takechi, Applicants respectfully submit that while Takechi discloses a system having the ability to determine whether a software section is legitimate application software for the protection of copyright, that Takechi does not disclose,

suggest or otherwise render obvious the above-noted features recited in amended claim 1 which indicate that composite content includes a plurality of pieces of content that are respectively protected by a plurality of different protection methods, the content use device comprising a determination unit operable to determine, from among the plurality of different protection methods, one protection method that corresponds to the selected one piece of content; and a decryption unit operable to decrypt the selected one piece of content based on the determined protection method.

IV. Conclusion

In view of the above, reconsideration and allowance of this application are now believed to be in order, and such actions are hereby solicited. If any points remain in issue which the Examiner feels may best be resolved through a personal or telephone interview, the Examiner is kindly requested to contact the undersigned at the telephone number listed below.

Respectfully submitted,

Masaya YAMAMOTO et al.

/Kenneth W. Fields/
By 2009.12.29 13:36:13 -05'00'
Kenneth W. Fields
Registration No. 52,430
Attorney for Applicants

KWF/krq
Washington, D.C. 20005-1503
Telephone (202) 721-8200
Facsimile (202) 721-8250
December 29, 2009